

Serial No. **09/891,300**

Amendment dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2005

Docket No. **P-0213**

### **REMARKS**

By the present response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to further clarify the invention.

Claims 1-7, 10-17 and 20-30 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,604,143 (Nagar et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,798 (Coley et al.) and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0160790 (Schwartz et al.). Claims 5-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Coley in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0020242 (Gupta et al.), Nagar et al. and Schwartz et al.

#### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagar et al. in view of Cooley et al and Schwartz et al. Applicants have discussed the deficiencies of these references in Applicant's previously filed responses and reassert all arguments submitted in these responses. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and provides the following additional remarks.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of this claim. For example, the Examiner asserts that Nagar et al. discloses a ITP proxy to perform an authentication function for an access request from the internal network to the external network, at col. 4, lines 62 - col. 5, line 48. However, these portions merely disclose details

Serial No. **09/891,300**

Amendment dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2005

Docket No. **P-0213**

related to the proxy server performing forward filtering that includes filtering requests originating from within the intranet that are destined for the internet as well as responses to these requests, and reverse filtering where the proxy server filters requests originating from the internet that are destined for the intranet as well as the responses to these requests, that the proxy servers may contain a servlet which is code that allows the proxy server to communicate utilizing any number of well known protocols, and that the proxy server stores data into a cache of the firewall after it is received from a remote location via a request. This is not a FTP proxy to perform an authentication function for an access request, as recited in the claims of the present application. Nagar et al. merely discloses filters that allow a user to tailor what and how information gets filtered and thus modifies the information between the client process and the server process in some manner (see, col. 3, lines 37-43). This is not an authentication function. Moreover, these portions of Nagar et al. do not disclose or suggest a FTP proxy to recover copies of log information related to the transmission of data by an authenticated user. Nagar et al. merely discloses storing the data transmitted in a cache.

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Nagar discloses a file system to store data transmitted from the internal network to the external network according to the control of the FTP proxy wherein the file system stores data according to a type of the data, and wherein the type of data is at least one of ASCII, EBCDIC, and Image, at col. 5, lines 32-48, and Figure 2 no. 242. However, as noted previously, these portions merely disclose that the proxy server stores

Serial No. **09/891,300**

Amendment dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2005

Docket No. **P-0213**

the filtered data into a cache, thus avoiding communication overhead by satisfying subsequent requests for the data by using the locally stored copy of the data. These portions do not disclose or suggest a file system that stores data according to a type of the data, as recited in the claims of the present application. Storing data according to a type is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cache in Nagar et al.

The Examiner admits that Nagar et al. does not disclose or suggest a database to store log information related to the transmission of data according to the control of the FTP proxy by any authenticated user, but asserts that Cooley discloses these limitations at col. 13, lines 24-36. However, these portions merely disclose a security feature in the firewall system being a transaction log that gathers information associated with any access request message seeking to connect to or inquire about network elements residing behind the firewall. This is not a database to store log information related to the transmission of data according to the control of the FTP proxy, as recited in the claims of the present application. Cooley merely relates to a log that gathers information associated with an access request message. This is not log information related to the transmission of data.

The Examiner further asserts that Cooley et al. discloses that if the user ID is “Anonymous” interrupting the transmission of the received service command to the external network, at col.9, lines 35-62 and col. 10, lines 13-29. However, these portions merely disclose that source address verification occurs that involves a determination of whether a host source

address of an incoming packet comports with a list of authorized or unauthorized addresses or is within a desired range, that if the source address is not on the list the packet is discarded, and that a proxy agent may include a set of tests to check for ferreting out and discarding packets having nested executable commands. This is not determining if the user ID is “Anonymous” interrupting the transmission of the received service command to the external network, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions merely relate to discarding a packet if a source address is not on a list and preventing messages that attempt to initiate a process by intercepting and discarding the messages. This has nothing to do with interrupting a transmission of the received service command to the external network. Cooley et al. relates to discarding packets and messages and not interrupting a transmission.

The Examiner admits that neither Nagar nor Cooley et al. disclose or suggest wherein access control is not performed if the ID transmitted from the internal user is “Anonymous”, such that the internal user is permitted to connect to a server located in the external network without access control, but asserts that Schwartz et al. discloses these limitations in paragraphs 0036 and 0026. However, these portions merely disclose that each of the mobile devices is assigned a device ID that can be a phone number of the device or an IP address or a combination of an IP address and a port number, that the device ID is associated with a subscriber ID, that each of the mobile devices serviced by the link server has a unique device ID that corresponds to a respective user account in the link server, and that a user account is created

Serial No. **09/891,300**

Amendment dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2005

Docket No. **P-0213**

for a mobile device that anonymously communicates with the link server where the anonymous mobile device is provided limited access of the services by the link server. This is not access control not being performed if the ID transmitted from the internal user is “Anonymous”, such that the internal user is permitted to connect to a server located in the external network without access control, as recited in the claims of the present application. In fact, these portions of Schwartz teach away from the limitations in the claims of the present application in that Schwartz et al. discloses that a mobile device that anonymously communicates with the link server is provided limited access to services provided by the link server.

Regarding claims 2-4, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims of 1-4 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 5-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coolcy et al. in view of Gupta et al., Nagar et al. and Schwartz et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding claims 5 and 14, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken

Serial No. **09/891,300**

Amendment dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2005

Docket No. **P-0213**

alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims. For example, the deficiencies of Cooley et al. and Nagar et al. have already been discussed. Moreover, the Examiner admits that Cooley et al. does not disclose or suggest if the received service command is a command designating a type of data storing the designated type of data in a file system, or recording the transmission and reception of service, but asserts that Gupta et al. discloses these limitations on page 4, paragraph 0057. However, this portion merely discloses that a proxy stores information in a raw database, such as information relating to a request for a URL from a client, text of a search executed by a user on an internet search engine, and time that the user spends on a particular website. This has nothing with to do with determining if a received service command is a command designating a type of data, and then storing the designated type of data in a file system, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, these portions do not disclose or suggest determining if the received service command is a command requesting data transmission, and if so, transmitting data from the internal user and recording the transmission and reception of services. These portions merely disclose a proxy storing URL request information and internet search information from a client in a database. This occurs every time the client makes these requests or initiates an internet search. These portions have nothing to do with determining if a received service command is requesting data transmission or designating a type of data, and transmitting data or storing the designated type of data, respectively.

Serial No. **09/891,300**

Amendment dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2005

Docket No. **P-0213**

The Examiner again admits that Cooley et al., Gupta et al., and Nagar et al. do not disclose or suggest wherein access control is not performed if the ID transmitted from the internal user is “Anonymous”, such that the internal user is permitted to connect to the server without access control, but asserts that Schwartz et al. discloses these limitations in paragraphs 0036 and 0026. However, as noted previously, Schwartz et al. does not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. The Examiner appears to be using impermissible hindsight by reading the limitations in the claims of present application back into the cited references.

Regarding claims 6, 7, 10-13, 15, 126, 17, and 20-22, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 5 and 14, and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 5-22 of the present application. Applicant respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

#### Unexamined Claims

Applicant notes that the Examiner provides no rejections for claims 23-30 submitted in Applicant’s previously filed Amendment dated August 3, 2005. Accordingly, Applicant assumes that these claims are allowed. Moreover, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable over

Serial No. **09/891,300**

Amendment dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2005

Docket No. **P-0213**

the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, for the same reasons noted previously regarding the other claims.

Serial No. **09/891,300**

Amendment dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2005

Docket No. **P-0213**

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks Applicant submits that claims 1-7, 10-17 and 20-30 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Fredrick D. Bailey at the telephone number listed below. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186  
Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg  
**Date: February 21, 2006**  
**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**